

From: [Baker, Lorie](#)
To: [Bleiler, Justin](#)
Subject: RE: Libbey Owens Ford SI review
Date: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 11:51:10 AM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)

Justin,

It seems that you have both tox and geo support for further GW investigation. Before you do VI you really need to know more of the extent of the GW plume so if WV wants to do an SI here, then would suggest focusing on investigation the GW plume - at least geoprobes if not shallow GW wells. Then if there seems to be a significant VOC plume, the next step would be to do a VI investigation at the buildings that are over the plume area.

From: Bleiler, Justin

Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 11:30 AM

To: Baker, Lorie <Baker.Lorie@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: Libbey Owens Ford SI review

Hi Lorie,

Here are tox (below and attached excel doc) and hydro (attached word doc) reviews that were done for the subject site per your suggestion. I have a cooperative agreement meeting with WV coming up and wanted to know whether I should add a Site Inspection to their workplan for this site. The site schedule consists of a 1984 PA and 2001 SRA which resulted in a "Referred to Removal – NFRAP" status. It does not seem that Removal collected samples or performed a significant assessment because "it did not initially appear that any exposure potential was evident to drive removal activity." If you think further investigation is necessary (i.e. groundwater/VI), then would you suggest that WVDEP perform an SI?

Thanks,

Justin Bleiler

Site Assessment Manager, HSCD

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 3

1650 Arch St., 3HS12

Philadelphia, PA 19103

215-814-3308

bleiler.justin@epa.gov



From: Hubbard, Jennifer

Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 11:31 AM

To: Bleiler, Justin <Bleiler.Justin@epa.gov>

Cc: Ayodele, Ayowale <ayodele.ayowale@epa.gov>

Subject: Libbey Owens Ford SI review

As requested, I have reviewed the above-named SI, with particular attention to human health risk assessment. The following comments are offered.

The data were validated using IM1 and M2 validation. If future decisions require more rigorous data quality (e.g., if the site should be scored for HRS), revalidation to a higher validation level may be necessary.

Section 5.6 muddies the distinction between chemicals of potential concern (COPCs) and

contaminants of concern (COCs). In this case, the term COPC should actually be used, since the chemicals here did not receive a full quantitative risk assessment nor were they identified as needing remedial action objectives per the NCP.

This report was initially prepared in 2011 and thus used 2010 screening levels. In this review, I consulted the most recent screening levels, the fall 2017 RSLs. This results in some changes to the identification of COPCs. The SI screening also apparently used a Hazard Quotient of 1, when it should have used 0.1 to account for additive effects.

Sections 5.6.1, 5.6.2, 5.7: Because of the updated toxicity factors, PAHs would no longer be industrial COPCs in surface soil, and indeno[1,2,3-c,d]pyrene would no longer be an industrial COPC in subsurface soil.

Sections 5.6.3 and 5.7: Barium, nickel, vanadium and biphenyl should also be groundwater COPCs; PCE does not need to be a COPC.

Section 6.0: It is not clear why the report concludes that soil chemicals are not a significant source of contamination. The report does not perform a risk assessment beyond the screening step, so there is no demonstrated support for this statement. I performed simple default risk calculations (see attached) and found that using current defaults, worker exposures to this soil would fall within the NCP target risk ranges. However, future residential exposure to soils, especially subsurface soils, could exceed acceptable risks.

The potential residential risk drivers are arsenic, chromium, and benzo[a]pyrene. (However, the chromium risks conservatively assume hexavalent chromium, whereas the form of chromium in the soil may be the much less toxic trivalent species, and chromium might also be consistent with background, although background data were not available.) Although the site is currently used industrially, it is important to examine what controls exist to prevent unrestricted use of the site, and unacceptable risks, in the future.

The report should also note that groundwater concentrations of arsenic, TCE, BEHP, and carbon tetrachloride exceed MCLs.

Section 6.0: I agree that the extent of groundwater contamination is unknown, and that vapor intrusion should be considered.

Jennifer Hubbard, Toxicologist

Superfund Technical Support Branch (3HS41)

USEPA Region III

1650 Arch Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Tel. 215-814-3328

hubbard.jennifer@epa.gov